REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 14 June 2006. Responsive to the rejections made by the Examiner in Independent Claims 1,15, 27 and 29 and Claims 8-10, 12-14, 25 and 28 have been amended. Claims 6-7 and 11 have been canceled.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 7, 26 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 7 has been canceled by this Amendment. However, Claims 25 and 29 have been amended to correct the typographical errors cited by the Examiner.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Henty (U.S. Patent 7,006,014). Additionally, Claims 6 and 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henty. Claims 5 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henty in view of Ford (U.S. Patent Application 2004/0036632). Finally, Claims 7, 12-18, 21-23, and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henty in view of Mears, et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2004/0113892).

Prior to discussing the prior art relied upon by the Examiner in making the rejections, it is believed beneficial to first briefly describe the Applicant's inventive method for constituting bootstrap hotkeys in light of the amended Claims, the Specification, and the Drawings.

Among the features of the inventive method include the steps of: identifying a predetermined keyboard, executing a host computer's hotkey bootstrap codes when the host computer is initially booted, transferring a keyboard-identification means from the host computer to a keyboard, transmitting a keyboard-confirmation means to the keyboard-identification means, terminating the hotkey's bootstrap codes when the keyboard-confirmation means is not recognized by the hotkey's bootstrap codes, displaying on the host computer screen a menu of hotkey functions, and executing the application program associated with the application indicating portion corresponding to the input-key indicating portion.

In an alternate embodiment Applicant's inventive method includes an input system with bootstrap hotkey's comprising: a host computer that executes a hotkey's bootstrap codes when the host computer is initially booted, wherein the hotkey's bootstrap codes transmit a keyboard-identification means to a keyboard connected to the host computer. Additionally, the keyboard transmits a keyboard-confirmation means that corresponds to the keyboard-identification means. The host computer further displays a menu of hotkey functions on the host computer's computer screen if a depressed single or combination key is recognized as a bootstrap hotkey by the hotkey's bootstrap codes.

The Henty reference discloses a wireless keyboard and reader combination. It is respectfully submitted that Henty fails to disclose among other things, the step of: "... executing a host computer's hotkey's bootstrap codes by a host computer when said host computer is initially booted," as recited in newly amended Independent Claim 1. Additionally, Henty fails to disclose " an input system .. [with] a host computer that executes a hotkey's bootstrap codes, when said host computer initially booted," as recited in newly amended Independent Claim 15. In fact, the Examiner is believed to acknowledge this in the Official Action.

The present invention employs a step and input system for executing a hotkey's bootstrap codes when the host computer is initially booted. This step is performed during the host computer's initial booting in order to perform the task independent of either the host computer's operating system or built in software that is unique to any one computer. Thus, a user is afforded the opportunity of expanding hotkey functions without increasing cost, as taught on pages 1-2 of the Specification as filed.

Conversely, Henty, merely describes a computer system which ultimately increases the battery lifetime of a wireless keyboard. While Henty discloses that the computer system has a "reader unit," the reader unit does not execute the host computer's hotkey bootstrap codes. Instead, the reader unit generates an interrogating field which supplies energy to a transponder in a wireless keyboard once a key is activated (see col. 3 lines 43-60). Thus, the reader unit can not "execute a hotkey bootstrap when said host computer is initially booted."

Moreover, Henty's reader unit does not "transmit a keyboard-identification means." As discussed above, Henty's reader unit merely sends energy to a transponder in the wireless keyboard, and when a key in the keyboard is activated, an antenna in the keyboard enables the keyboard to provide a coded response (specific to the key that is pressed) to the reader (See Col. 3 lines 43-60). Therefore, as Henty discusses that energy from the reader unit is not transferred until a key is activated on the keyboard, there can not be an initial keyboard-identification means transmitted by the reader. Furthermore, at best Henty's wireless keyboard "transmits a keyboard confirmation means," when the keyboard provides a coded response to the reader.

Thus as Henty fails to disclose each and every element of the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed, it is not believed to anticipate that invention. Further as the reference fails to suggest such a combination of elements and in fact fails to recognize the problem solved by the claimed invention, it is not believed to make obvious that invention either.

Ford does not overcome the deficiencies of Henty. Ford discloses a universal display keyboard with a plurality of keys that may be altered via electronically-alterable displays associated with the keys. While arguably, Ford discusses an external computer being coupled to the keyboard, he states that "the computer is functionally separate from [the] keyboard system and need not perform operations that support the function of [the] keyboard system. (See Paragraphs [0039-0040]).

Therefore, as neither Henty nor Ford disclose or suggest the unique combination of elements that form the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed, that combination does not make obvious the invention.

Furthermore, Mears does not overcome the deficiencies of Henty or Ford. Mears discloses a universal remote control including a display. Mears in fact teaches away from the present invention.

Thus, as none of the Henty, Mears, et al., nor Ford disclose or suggest the unique elements that form the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed, their combination is not believed to make obvious the invention. Therefore, it is believed that Independent Claims 1, 15, 27 and 29 are now allowable. Further, it is believed that dependent Claims 8-10, 12-14, 25 and 28 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the Claims upon which they depend.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant believes that the subject Patent Application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

The prior art made of record but not relied upon in the Office Action is believed to be further removed from the present invention than the references relied upon by the Examiner.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this Amendment. However, if there are any charges associated with this filing, the Director of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account #18-2011 for such charges.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

Morton J Rosenberg

Morton J. Rosenberg
Registration #26,049

Dated: 22 September 2006

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586